



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,895	03/28/2001	Keiichi Onodera	041514-5116	9524

9629 7590 10/14/2004

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

PHAM, HAI CHI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2861

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/817,895	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ONODERA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Hai C Pham	<b>Art Unit</b> 2861	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hai C Pham. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Paul Fournier, Attorney. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 12 October 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 15,32,47,48,56 and 57.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kobayashi (U.S. 6,088,323), Nomula (U.S. 4,967,286), Cutler (U.S. 5,967,676).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Representative points out the difference between the teaching of the Kobayashi and the claimed limitation in claim 15, which defines the light reflectance difference between the pit and the pitless area of the recording medium as compare to Kobayashi, which defines the light reflectance difference being based on the difference of the pit width. The examiner indicates that the cited reference will be further studied. On the other hand, claims 56 and 57 fail to include the specific limitation that would overcome the prior art in Cutler, namely the address information data being embedded in the optical disc. Claims 15, 32, 47 and 48 will be amended to remove the changes made on April 14, 2004, to overcome the 112 rejection.

hcl

10/12/04